arXiv:1112.1080v1 [math.AG] 5 Dec 2011

On the motive of fourfolds with a nef tangent bundle

Charles Vial

Abstract

Let X be a complex smooth projective fourfold with a nef tangent bundle. Then we show that X has a Chow-Künneth decomposition and that the motivic Lefschetz conjecture holds for X. We also show that if X is not the finite quotient of an abelian variety then X satisfies Murre's conjectures. More generally, we establish Murre's conjectures for complex fourfolds whose Chow group of zero-cycles is generated by zero-cycles on a product of curves. Fourfolds with a nef tangent bundle are instances of such fourfolds via a classification result of Demailly-Peternell-Schneider.

Introduction

Throughout this paper, algebraic cycles and Chow groups are with rational coefficients. Basically, understanding the motive of a smooth projective variety X of dimension d over a field k amounts to studying algebraic cycles on $X \times X$, as well as their action on the cohomology groups of X and on the Chow groups of X. For example, Grothendieck's Lefschetz standard conjecture asserts that there should exist for all $i \geq 0$ algebraic cycles $\gamma_i \in CH^i(X \times X)$ inducing isomorphisms $(\gamma_i)_* : H_i(X) \to H_{2d-i}(X)$. If this is the case, then [1, 5.4.2.1] there exist algebraic cycles $\pi_i \in CH_d(X \times X)$ inducing the projections $H_*(X) \to H_i(X) \to H_*(X)$. Such algebraic cycles are called *Künneth projectors*. More far-reaching are Murre's conjectures [11]. These stipulate first that the Künneth projectors π_i above can be chosen to be pairwise orthogonal idempotents in $CH_d(X \times X)$ adding to the diagonal Δ_X. These conjectures then dictate that the action of the so-called *Chow-Künneth idempotents* π_i on the Chow groups of X is prescribed and independent of choices. Precisely, Murre conjectured the following.

(A) X has a Chow-Künneth decomposition $\{\pi_0, \ldots, \pi_{2d}\}$: There exist mutually orthogonal idempotents $\pi_0, \ldots, \pi_{2d} \in CH_d(X \times X)$ adding to the identity such that $(\pi_i)_* H_*(X) = H_i(X)$ for all i.

(B) $\pi_0, \ldots, \pi_{2l-1}, \pi_{d+l+1}, \ldots, \pi_{2d}$ act trivially on $CH_l(X)$ for all l.

(C) $F^i CH_l(X) := \mathrm{Ker}\,(\pi_{2l}) \cap \ldots \cap \mathrm{Ker}\,(\pi_{2l+i-1})$ doesn't depend on the choice of the π_j's. Here the π_j's are acting on $CH_l(X)$.

(D) $F^1 CH_l(X) = \mathrm{Ker}\,\big(CH_l(X) \to H_{2l}(X)\big)$.

Given a Chow-Künneth decomposition $\{\pi_0, \dots, \pi_{2d}\}$ for X, the *motivic Lefschetz conjecture* is a generalisation to rational equivalence of the Lefschetz standard conjecture. It says that there should exist correspondences $\Gamma_i \in CH^i(X \times X)$ such that $\pi_i \circ L^{d-i} \circ \pi_{2d-i} \circ \Gamma_i \circ \pi_i = \pi_i$ and $\pi_{2d-i} \circ \Gamma_i \circ \pi_i \circ L^{d-i} \circ \pi_{2d-i} = \pi_{2d-i}$ in $CH_d(X \times X)$. In other words, Γ_i should induce an isomorphism of Chow motives $(X, \pi_{2d-i}) \to (X, \pi_i, d-i)$ whose inverse is given by L^{d-i}. Here L is equal to the composition $\Gamma_\iota \circ {}^t\Gamma_\iota$ where $\iota : H \hookrightarrow X$ is a smooth hyperplane section, Γ_ι is its graph in $H \times X$ and ${}^t\Gamma_\iota$ is the transpose of Γ_ι. The statement of the motivic Lefschetz conjecture modulo homological equivalence is precisely the Lefschetz standard conjecture for X, see [1, 5.2.5.1].

A property of smooth projective varieties related to Murre's conjectures is Kimura's notion of finite-dimensionality [9]. We refer to [13, §3] for details on the links between those conjectures. Kimura's notion of finite-dimensionality for Chow groups has sparked a lot of interest recently because, when combined to Jannsen's semisimplicity theorem [7], it makes it possible to exhibit certain idempotents modulo rational equivalence. Let's mention that varieties dominated by a product of curves (e.g. abelian varieties) are finite-dimensional in the sense of Kimura and, in characteristic zero at least, satisfy the Lefschetz standard conjecture.

In this paper, motivated by a structure theorem for complex varieties with a nef tangent bundle of Demailly-Peternell-Schneider, which is recalled in section 1, we wish to prove these conjectures on algebraic cycles for varieties of dimension ≤ 4 whose Chow group of zero-cycles is generated by the Chow group of zero-cycles on a product of curves. Here's our first result.

Theorem 1. *Let X be a smooth projective variety of dimension ≤ 4 over a field $k \subseteq \mathbf{C}$. Assume that there exist a smooth projective variety Y which satisfies Grothendieck's Lefschetz standard conjecture, as well as a correspondence $\Gamma \in CH_{\dim Y}(Y \times X)$ such that the induced map $(\Gamma_{k(X)})_* : CH_0(Y_{k(X)}) \to CH_0(X_{k(X)})$ is surjective. Then X satisfies the Lefschetz standard conjecture.*

In particular, as explained earlier, theorem 1 gives the existence of Künneth projectors, i.e. of cycles $\pi_i \in CH_d(X \times X)$ inducing the projections $H_*(X) \to H_i(X) \to H_*(X)$. Theorem 1 is a first step towards the proof of our main theorem.

Theorem 2. *Let X be a smooth projective variety over a field $k \subseteq \mathbf{C}$. Assume that there exist a smooth projective variety Y which satisfies the Lefschetz standard conjecture and which is finite-dimensional in the sense of Kimura, as well as a correspondence $\Gamma \in CH_{\dim Y}(Y \times X)$ such that the induced map $(\Gamma_{k(X)})_* : CH_0(Y_{k(X)}) \to CH_0(X_{k(X)})$ is surjective. Then,*

- *if $\dim X \leq 4$, X has a Chow-Künneth decomposition which satisfies the motivic Lefschetz conjecture and Murre's conjecture (B);*
- *if $\dim X \leq 4$ and $\dim Y \leq 3$, X satisfies Murre's conjecture (D);*

- *if* $\dim X \leq 3$*, X is finite-dimensional in the sense of Kimura;*
- *if* $\dim X \leq 3$ *and* $\dim Y \leq 2$*, X satisfies Murre's conjecture (C).*

Let's now assume that $k = \mathbf{C}$. Obvious examples of varieties X satisfying the assumptions of theorem 2 are given by smooth projective varieties of dimension ≤ 4 dominated by a product of curves. For such varieties, theorem 2 is essentially proved in [13, §4.2]. A typical and more general situation where the conditions of theorem 2 are met and for which the results of [13] are not sufficient is the following:

$$\begin{tikzcd}
X' \arrow[r, dashed, "g"] \arrow[d, dashed, "f"'] & X \\
A &
\end{tikzcd}$$

Here, A is an abelian variety, f and g are dominant rational maps and a general fibre of a resolution of f has trivial Chow group of zero-cycles. Proposition 2.3 provides a correspondence $\Gamma \in CH_{\dim A}(A \times X)$ such that $\Gamma_* : CH_0(A_{k(X)}) \to CH_0(X_{k(X)})$ is surjective.

Theorem 2.5 is then a reformulation of theorem 2 in this setting.

Using the classification result of Demailly-Peternell-Schneider [4] which is recalled in section 1 we see that theorem 2 applies to complex varieties with a nef tangent bundle:

Corollary 1. *Let X be a complex smooth projective variety with a nef tangent bundle. Assume that* $\dim X \leq 4$*. Then X satisfies the standard conjectures and X has a Chow-Künneth decomposition which satisfies the motivic Lefschetz conjecture and Murre's conjecture (B). Moreover, if X is not the finite quotient of an abelian fourfold then X satisfies Murre's conjectures (D), and if X has dimension ≤ 3 then X is finite-dimensional in the sense of Kimura.*

This corollary is proved in section 2, assuming theorem 2 whose proof is postponed to the two last sections. This corollary generalises a previous result of Iyer [6] who proved such a result for varieties of dimension ≤ 3 with a nef tangent bundle. Iyer's proof depends on a result of Campana-Peternell [3] which states that, in the above picture, $f : X' \to A$ is a relative cellular variety over an abelian variety A and $g : X' \to X$ is finite étale. Our result is more general as it covers the cases where neither f nor g are assumed to be smooth.

Theorem 1 is proved in section 3 along with theorem 3.6 – a result of independent interest which is a refinement of a theorem of Bloch and Srinivas [2]. Theorem 2 is split into a statement for fourfolds in theorem 4.1 and into a statement for threefolds in theorem 5.2. Theorem 4.1 is proved in section 4 while theorem 5.2 is proved in section 5. We could have proved Murre's conjectures for threefolds as in theorem 2 along the same lines as for fourfolds. However, we decided to give a slightly different proof: we first prove that threefolds as in theorem 2 are finite-dimensional in the sense of Kimura and then deduce thanks to the results of [13] that they satisfy Murre's conjectures. Actually, proving Murre's conjectures for threefolds as in theorem 2 is made simpler by using the fact that we can actually prove finite-dimensionality for them. As a corollary of the results of section 5 we re-obtain Iyer's result [6] on the finite-dimensionality of threefolds with a nef tangent bundle.

Conventions and notations. In this paper, we restrict ourselves to fields of characteristic zero for convenience. The characteristic zero assumption is essential to the proof of proposition 3.7 and is desirable for the proof of lemma 4.16. Lemma 3.1, proposition 3.2 and theorem 3.6 are valid in any characteristic.

Chow groups are always meant with rational coefficients and for short we write $CH_i(X)$ for $CH_i(X) \otimes_{\mathbf{Z}} \mathbf{Q}$. A variety X over a field k is said to have trivial Chow group of zero-cycles if $CH_0(X) = \mathbf{Q}$. We say that a general fibre of a dominant morphism $f : X \to Y$ satisfies some property $\mathcal{P}$ if there exists a Zariski dense open subset U of Y such that every closed fibre of $f|_U : X|_U \to U$ satisfies property $\mathcal{P}$. A complex smooth projective variety X is said to have *nef tangent bundle* T_X if the line-bundle $O_{T_X}(1)$ on $\mathbf{P}(T_X)$ is nef. Motives are defined in a covariant setting and the notations are those of [12]. Briefly, a Chow motive M is a triple (X, p, n) where X is a variety of pure dimension d, $p \in CH_d(X \times X)$ is an idempotent ($p \circ p = p$) and n is an integer. The motive of X is $\mathfrak{h}(X) := (X, \Delta_X, 0)$, where Δ_X is the class of the diagonal in $CH_d(X \times X)$. A morphism between two motives (X, p, n) and (Y, q, m) is a correspondence in $q \circ CH_{d+m-n}(X \times Y) \circ p$. We have $CH_i(X, p, n) = p_* CH_{i-n}(X)$ and $H_i(X, p, n) = p_* H_{i-2n}(X)$, where we write $H_i(X) := H^{2d-i}(X(\mathbf{C}), \mathbf{Q})$ for singular homology.

Aknowledgements. This work is supported by a Thomas Nevile Research Fellowship at Magdalene College, Cambridge and an EPSRC Postdoctoral Fellowship under grant EP/H028870/1. I would like to thank both institutions for their support.

1 On the classification of varieties with a nef tangent bundle

Theorem 1.1 (Demailly-Peternell-Schneider [4])**.** *Let X be a smooth projective complex variety with a nef tangent bundle. Then there is an étale cover $X' \to X$ of X such that $X' \to A$ is a smooth morphism over an abelian variety A, whoses fibres are smooth Fano varieties with a nef tangent bundle.*

Recall that the irregularity of a smooth projective complex variety X is the integer $q(X) := \dim_{\mathbf{C}} H^1(X, O_X)$. Demailly, Peternell and Schneider actually proved that X' as in the theorem above can be chosen to be any étale cover of X with maximum irregularity, i.e.

$$q(X') = \max\{q(\widetilde{X}) : \widetilde{X} \to X \text{ finite étale}\},$$

and that $X' \to A$ is the Albanese map from X to its Albanese variety.

2 Proof of corollary 1 assuming theorem 2

Let's recall the following well-known lemma.

Lemma 2.1. *Let X be an irreducible variety over a field k and let $\overline{\eta}_X$ be a geometric generic point of X. Then, $CH_0(X_K) = \mathbf{Q}$ for all field extensions K/k if and only if $CH_0(X_{\overline{\eta}_X}) = \mathbf{Q}$.*

Proof. Let K/k be a field extension. The map $CH_0(X_K) \to CH_0(X_{\overline{K}})$ induced by base-change is injective [5, Ex. 1.7.4] so that it is enough to show that if $CH_0(X_{\overline{\eta}_X}) = \mathbf{Q}$ then $CH_0(X_{\overline{K}}) = \mathbf{Q}$ for all algebraically closed fields $\overline{K}/k$. Fix a geometric point $x \in X(\overline{k})$, let $\overline{K}/k$ be an algebraically closed extension and let $p : \mathrm{Spec}\ \overline{K} \to X_{\overline{K}}$ be a closed point of $X_{\overline{K}}$ over $\overline{K}$. The composite morphism of schemes $\mathrm{Spec}\ \overline{K} \to X_{\overline{K}} \to X$ factors through a morphism $\mathrm{Spec}\ L \to X$, where L is an algebraically closed field isomorphic to a field sitting between $\overline{k}$ and $\overline{k(X)}$. The restriction $X_{\overline{k(X)}}$ of X to $\mathrm{Spec}\ \overline{k(X)} \to \mathrm{Spec}\ L \to \mathrm{Spec}\ k$ is isomorphic as a scheme to $X_{\overline{\eta}_X}$. By assumption $CH_0(X_{\overline{\eta}_X}) = \mathbf{Q}$, so that $CH_0(X_{\overline{k(X)}}) = \mathbf{Q}$ as well. The base-change map $CH_0(X_L) \to CH_0(X_{\overline{k(X)}})$ is injective so that $CH_0(X_L) = \mathbf{Q}$. Thus the image of the natural morphism $\mathrm{Spec}\ L \to X_L$ is rationally equivalent to x_L in X_L. It follows that p is rationally equivalent to $x_{\overline{K}}$ in $X_{\overline{K}}$ and hence that $CH_0(X_{\overline{K}}) = \mathbf{Q}$. □

Lemma 2.2. *Let $f : X' \to Y$ be a dominant morphism between smooth projective complex varieties. Assume that a general fibre F of f satisfies $CH_0(F) = \mathbf{Q}$. Let $K/\mathbf{C}$ be a field extension. Then a general fibre F of $f_K : X'_K \to Y_K$ also satisfies $CH_0(F) = \mathbf{Q}$.*

Proof. Let $K/\mathbf{C}$ be a field extension and let $U \subset Y$ be a Zariski open subset of Y such that for all $P \in U(\mathbf{C})$ we have $CH_0(X'_P) = \mathbf{Q}$. Every fibre F of $(f_K)|_{U_K}$ admits a finitely generated extension of $\mathbf{C}$ as a field of definition. Therefore, according to lemma 2.1, we only need consider the case of fields $K/\mathbf{C}$ which are algebraically closed and of finite transcendence degree over $\mathbf{C}$. Let then $\overline{K}/\mathbf{C}$ be an algebraically closed field extension of finite transcendence degree and let $Q : \mathrm{Spec}\ \overline{K} \to U_{\overline{K}}$ be a closed point of $U_{\overline{K}}$ over $\overline{K}$. Choose an isomorphism $\overline{K} \simeq \mathbf{C}$ and consider the commutative diagram

$$\begin{tikzcd}
\mathrm{Spec}\ \overline{K} \arrow[r] \arrow[dr, "\mathrm{id}"'] & U_{\overline{K}} \arrow[d] \\
& \mathrm{Spec}\ \overline{K}.
\end{tikzcd}$$

If we pull-back this diagram along the isomorphism $\mathbf{C} \xrightarrow{\simeq} \overline{K}$, then we see that X'_Q is isomorphic as a scheme to a closed fibre F of $X'|_U \to U$ (thanks to Burt Totaro for noticing this). By definition of Chow groups, we have $CH^d(X'_Q) \simeq CH^d(F)$ and we may conclude that $CH_0(X'_Q) = \mathbf{Q}$. □

Proposition 2.3. *Let* $f : X' \dashrightarrow Y$ *be a dominant rational map between smooth projective complex varieties. Assume that a general fibre* F *of a resolution of* f *satisfies* $CH_0(F) = \mathbf{Q}$*. Let then* $g : X' \dashrightarrow X$ *be a dominant rational map to a smooth projective variety* X *of dimension* d*. Then there exists a correspondence* $\Gamma \in CH^d(Y \times X)$ *such that* $(\Gamma_K)_* : CH_0(Y_K) \to CH_0(X_K)$ *is surjective for all field extensions* $K/\mathbf{C}$*.*

Proof. Let $\varphi : \widetilde{X}' \to X'$ be a resolution of f such that a general fibre F of $f \circ \varphi$ satisfies $CH_0(F) = \mathbf{Q}$. By lemma 2.2 and by [12, Theorem 1.3] there is a correspondence $\gamma \in CH_{\dim Y}(Y \times \widetilde{X}')$ such that $(\gamma_K)_* : CH_0(Y_K) \to CH_0(\widetilde{X}'_K)$ is an isomorphism for all field extensions $K/\mathbf{C}$. The rational map $g \circ \varphi$ is dominant and because the Chow group of zero-cycles is a birational invariant for smooth proper varieties [5, 16.1.11] we get, up to resolving $g \circ \varphi$, that $(g_K \circ \varphi_K)_* : CH_0(\widetilde{X}'_K) \to CH_0(X_K)$ is surjective. Therefore the correspondence $\Gamma := \Gamma_{g \circ \varphi} \circ \gamma \in CH^{\dim X}(Y \times X)$ induces a surjective morphism $(\Gamma_K)_* : CH_0(Y_K) \to CH_0(X_K)$ for all field extensions $K/\mathbf{C}$. ☐

Corollary 2.4. *Let* X *be a variety of dimension* d *with a nef tangent bundle. Then there exist an abelian variety* A *of dimension* $\leq d$ *and a correspondence* $\Gamma \in CH^d(A \times X)$ *such that* $(\Gamma_K)_* : CH_0(A_K) \to CH_0(X_K)$ *is surjective for all field extensions* $K/\mathbf{C}$*.*

Proof. By theorem 1.1, there is a finite étale morphism $X' \to X$ and a smooth Fano fibration $X' \to A$ over an abelian variety. Fano varieties are rationally connected and hence have trivial Chow group of zero-cycles. We can now apply proposition 2.3. ☐

Because every abelian variety satisfies the Lefschetz standard conjecture [1, 5.2.4.5] and is Kimura finite-dimensional [9], corollary 2.4 settles corollary 1 assuming theorem 2. We actually get from proposition 2.3 a more general statement.

Theorem 2.5. *Let* $f : X' \dashrightarrow Y$ *be a dominant rational map between smooth projective complex varieties. Assume that a general fibre* F *of a resolution of* f *satisfies* $CH_0(F) = \mathbf{Q}$ *and assume that* Y *is Kimura finite-dimensional and satisfies the Lefschetz standard conjecture. Let then* $g : X' \dashrightarrow X$ *be a dominant rational map to a smooth projective variety* X*. Then,*

- *if* $\dim X \leq 4$*,* X *has a Chow-Künneth decomposition which satisfies the motivic Lefschetz conjecture and Murre's conjecture (B);*
- *if* $\dim X \leq 4$ *and* $\dim Y \leq 3$*,* X *satisfies Murre's conjecture (D);*
- *if* $\dim X \leq 3$*,* X *is finite-dimensional in the sense of Kimura;*
- *if* $\dim X \leq 3$ *and* $\dim Y \leq 2$*,* X *satisfies Murre's conjecture (C).*

Proof. By proposition 2.3, there exists a correspondence $\Gamma \in CH^d(Y \times X)$ such that $(\Gamma_{k(X)})_* : CH_0(Y_{k(X)}) \to CH_0(X_{k(X)})$ is surjective. We can therefore apply theorem 2. ☐

3 Proof of theorem 1

In order to prove theorem 1, we need a slight refinement of the decomposition of the diagonal argument of Bloch and Srinivas which appears in [2]. This is embodied in theorem 3.6. It will also prove useful for the proof of theorem 2. Up to the statement of proposition 3.7, there is no restriction on the characteristic of the base field k.

First we prove a lemma which is quoted in [1, 3.1.4] without proof. Let X, X', Y and Y' be smooth projective varieties over a field k. Let $a \in CH_p(X' \times X)$, $b \in CH_q(Y \times Y')$ and $\gamma \in CH_r(X \times Y)$ be correspondences. Let's write $({}^t a, b) := \tau_*({}^t a \times b)$, where $\tau : X \times X' \times Y \times Y' \to X \times Y \times X' \times Y'$ is the map permuting the two middle factors.

Lemma 3.1. *We have the formula*

$$({}^t a, b)_* \gamma = b \circ \gamma \circ a \ \in CH_{p+q+r-\dim X-\dim Y}(X' \times Y').$$

Proof. If $X_1, X_2, \ldots, X_n$ are varieties and if $1 \leq i_1 < \ldots < i_m \leq n$ are integers, let's write $p^{X_1X_2\ldots X_n}_{X_{i_1}X_{i_2}\ldots X_{i_m}}$ for the projection $X_1 \times X_2 \times \ldots \times X_n \to X_{i_1} \times X_{i_2} \times \ldots \times X_{i_m}$.

Although this is essentially done in [5, 16.1.1], let's first prove the lemma in the case when a and b are graphs of morphisms or the transpose thereof. After transposing, we see that, for this purpose, it is actually enough to prove that $(\Delta_X, b)_*\gamma = b \circ \gamma$ for $\gamma \in CH_r(X \times Y)$ and $b \in CH_*(Y \times Z)$ in the following cases: b is the graph of a morphism $f : Y \to Z$ or b is the transpose of the graph of a morphism $g : Z \to Y$. The first case is [5, 16.1.1.(c).(i)]. Let's give a proof in the second case as an illustration of the method. Let $h : Z \to Y \times Z$ be the morphism $z \mapsto (g(z), z)$. Then we have $b = {}^t\Gamma_g = h_*[Z]$. Now,

$$\begin{array}{rcl}
{}^t\Gamma_g \circ \gamma & = & (p_{XZ})_*\big((p_{YZ}^* h_*[Z]) \cap p_{XY}^*\gamma\big) \\
& = & (p_{XZ})_*\big((\mathrm{id}_X \times h)_*(p_Z^{XZ})^*[Z] \cap p_{XY}^*\gamma\big) \\
& = & (p_{XZ})_*\big((\mathrm{id}_X \times h)_*(\mathrm{id}_X \times h)^* p_{XY}^*\gamma\big) \\
& = & (id_X \times g)^*\gamma \\
& = & (\Delta_X, {}^t\Gamma_g)_*\gamma.
\end{array}$$

Here, we have omitted the superscript "XYZ". The first equality is by definition of the composition law for correspondences. The second equality follows from the fibre square

$$\begin{tikzcd}
X \times Z \arrow[r, "\mathrm{id}_X \times h"] \arrow[d, "p_Z^{XZ}"'] & X \times Y \times Z \arrow[d, "p_{YZ}"'] \\
Z \arrow[r, "h"] & Y \times Z.
\end{tikzcd}$$

The third equality follows from the projection formula. The fourth equality follows from the equalities $p_{XY} \circ (id_X \times h) = \mathrm{id}_X \times g$ and $p_{XZ} \circ (id_X \times h) = \mathrm{id}_{XZ}$.

Let's now consider the case $X = X'$ and $b = [W]$, where W is an irreducible subvariety of $Y \times Y'$ of dimension q. We are going to prove that b is the composite of the graph of a morphism with the transpose of the graph of another morphism. For this purpose, let's consider an alteration $\sigma : \widetilde{W} \to W$ and let's define the composite morphism $h : \widetilde{W} \to W \hookrightarrow Y \times Y'$. Then, by proper pushforward, we have $\deg(\sigma) \cdot b = h_*[\widetilde{W}]$. Now,

$$\begin{array}{rcl}
\deg(\sigma) \cdot b \circ \gamma & = & (p_{XY'})_*\big((p_{YY'}^* h_*[\widetilde{W}]) \cap p_{XY}^*\gamma\big) \\
& = & (p_{XY'})_*\big((\mathrm{id}_X \times h)_*(p_{Y'}^{XY'})^*[\widetilde{W}] \cap p_{XY}^*\gamma\big) \\
& = & (p_{XY'})_*\big((\mathrm{id}_X \times h)_*(\mathrm{id}_X \times h)^* p_{XY}^*\gamma\big) \\
& = & (id_X \times (p_{Y'}^{YY'} \circ h))_*(id_X \times (p_{Y}^{YY'} \circ h))^*\gamma \\
& = & (\Delta_X, \Gamma_{p_{Y'}^{YY'} \circ h})_*(\Delta_X, {}^t\Gamma_{p_{Y}^{YY'} \circ h})_*\gamma \\
& = & \Gamma_{p_{Y'}^{YY'} \circ h} \circ {}^t\Gamma_{p_{Y}^{YY'} \circ h} \circ \gamma.
\end{array}$$

Here, we have omitted the superscript "XYY'". The first equality is by definition of the composition law for correspondences. The second equality follows from the fibre square

$$\begin{tikzcd}
X \times W \arrow[r, "\mathrm{id}_X \times h"] \arrow[d, "p_W^{XW}"'] & X \times Y \times Y' \arrow[d, "p_{YY'}"'] \\
W \arrow[r, "h"] & Y \times Y'.
\end{tikzcd}$$

The third equality follows from the projection formula. The fourth equality follows from the equalities $p_{XY} \circ (id_X \times h) = \mathrm{id}_X \times (p_Y^{YY'} \circ h)$ and $p_{XY'} \circ (id_X \times h) = \mathrm{id}_X \times (p_{Y'}^{YY'} \circ h)$. The fifth equality is [5, 16.1.2.(c)]. Finally, the last equality follows from the cases previously treated.

This last equality holds for all smooth projective varieties X, all integers r and all correspondences $\gamma \in CH_r(X \times Y)$. By Manin's identity principle [1, 4.3.1], we get

$$\deg(\sigma) \cdot b = \Gamma_{p_{Y'}^{YY'} \circ h} \circ {}^t\Gamma_{p_{Y}^{YY'} \circ h}. \qquad (1)$$

Let's now consider a correspondence $b \in CH_q(Y \times Y')$. Let W_i be irreducible subvarieties of $Y \times Y'$ and let b_i be rational numbers such that $b = \sum_i b_i \cdot [W_i]$ and let $\sigma_i : \widetilde{W_i} \to W_i$ be an alteration and let $h_i : \widetilde{W_i} \to Y \times Y'$ be the composite of σ_i with the embedding $W_i \hookrightarrow Y \times Y'$. Then, thanks to (1), we have

$$b = \sum_i \frac{b_i}{\deg \sigma_i} \cdot \Gamma_{p_{Y'}^{YY'} \circ h_i} \circ {}^t\Gamma_{p_{Y}^{YY'} \circ h_i}.$$

Likewise let V_j be irreducible subvarieties of $X' \times X$ such that $a = \sum_j a_j \cdot [V_j]$ and let $\tau_j : \widetilde{V_j} \to V_j$ be an alteration and let $g_j : \widetilde{V_j} \to X' \times X$ be the composite of τ_j with the embedding $V_j \hookrightarrow X' \times X$. Then we have

$$a = \sum_j \frac{a_j}{\deg \tau_j} \cdot \Gamma_{p_X^{X'X} \circ g_j} \circ {}^t\Gamma_{p_{X'}^{X'X} \circ g_j}.$$

We have thus reduced the proof of the lemma to the case where a and b are either graphs of morphisms or the transpose thereof. This was taken care of at the beginning of the proof. $\square$

Along the proof of lemma 3.1, we have actually proved the following which is unsurprising but for which we couldn't find a reference.

Proposition 3.2. *Let X and Y be smooth projective varieties over a field k. Let $\gamma \in CH_q(X \times Y)$ be a correspondence and let's choose a representative $\gamma = \sum_i c_i \cdot [C_i]$. Let $\sigma_i : \widetilde{C_i} \to C_i$ be an alteration and let $h_i : \widetilde{C_i} \to C_i \hookrightarrow X \times Y$. Then*

$$\gamma = \sum_i \frac{c_i}{\deg \sigma_i} \cdot \Gamma_{p_Y^{XY} \circ h_i} \circ {}^t\Gamma_{p_X^{XY} \circ h_i}.$$

Remark 3.3. It is actually easy to see thanks to the projection formula that the correspondences γ and $\sum_i \frac{c_i}{\deg \sigma_i} \cdot \Gamma_{p_Y^{XY} \circ h_i} \circ {}^t\Gamma_{p_X^{XY} \circ h_i}$ of proposition 3.2 induce the same action on $CH_*(X)$. As such, we could have concluded the proof of lemma 3.1 directly by saying that $(\Delta_X, \Gamma_{p_{Y'}^{YY'} \circ h})_*(\Delta_X, {}^t\Gamma_{p_Y^{YY'} \circ h})_*\gamma = (\Delta_X, b)_*\gamma$ thanks to the projection formula. However, we thought that the statement of proposition 3.2 was interesting by itself and deserved to be written down for future reference.

Lemma 3.4. *Let X, Y and Z be smooth projective varieties over a field k. Let $d := \dim X$ and let $\Gamma \in CH_q(Y \times Z)$ be a correspondence. Then the following diagram commutes.*

$$\begin{tikzcd}
CH_r(X \times Y) \arrow[r] \arrow[d, "(\Delta_X, \Gamma)_*"] & CH_{r-d}(k(X) \times Y) \arrow[d, "(\Gamma_{k(X)})_*"] \\
CH_{q+r-\dim Y}(X \times Z) \arrow[r] & CH_{q+r-d-\dim Y}(k(X) \times Z).
\end{tikzcd}$$

Proof. This diagram is obtained as the direct limit over the open inclusions $j_U : U \hookrightarrow X$ of the diagrams

$$\begin{tikzcd}
CH_r(X \times X) \arrow[r, "({}^t\Gamma_{j_U}, \Delta_X)_*"] \arrow[d, "(\Delta_X, \Gamma)_*"] & CH_r(U \times X) \arrow[d, "(\Delta_U, \Gamma)_*"] \\
CH_{q+r-\dim Y}(X \times Y) \arrow[r, "({}^t\Gamma_{j_U}, \Delta_Y)_*"] & CH_{q+r-\dim Y}(U \times Y).
\end{tikzcd}$$

The action of (Δ_U, Γ) on $CH_r(U \times X)$ is well-defined because (Δ_U, Γ) has a representative whose support is proper over $U \times Y$, cf. [5, Remark 16.1]. These diagrams commute for all U for the following reason. Let U, V and W be nonsingular open varieties and let $\alpha \in CH_i(U \times V)$ (resp. $\beta \in CH_j(V \times W)$) be a correspondence which has a representative which is proper over U and V (resp. V and W). Then, by *loc. cit.*, it is possible to define the composite $\beta \circ \alpha$ and to show as in [5, Proposition 16.1.2(a)] that $(\beta \circ \alpha)_* = \beta_* \circ \alpha_*$ on cycles. We may now conclude by checking that $(\Delta_U, \Gamma) \circ ({}^t\Gamma_{j_U}, \Delta_X) = ({}^t\Gamma_{j_U}, \Delta_Y) \circ (\Delta_X, \Gamma) = ({}^t\Gamma_{j_U}, \Gamma)$. $\square$

Lemma 3.5. *Let X and Y be smooth projective varieties over a field k. Let $\Gamma \in CH_n(X \times Y)$ be a correspondence. Let η_X be the generic point of X and let $[\eta_X] \in CH_0(X_{k(X)})$ be the class of η_X viewed as a rational point of $X_{k(X)}$. Then, under the natural map $CH_n(X \times Y) \to CH_{n-\dim X}(k(X) \times Y)$, Γ is mapped to $(\Gamma_{k(X)})_*[\eta_X]$.*

Proof. Let $d := \dim X$. Thanks to lemma 3.4 we have the following commutative diagram whose rows are exact by localisation

$$\begin{tikzcd}
CH_d(X \times X) \arrow[r] \arrow[d, "(\Delta_X{,}\Gamma)_*"] & CH_0(k(X) \times X) \arrow[r] \arrow[d, "(\Gamma_{k(X)})_*"] & 0 \\
CH_n(X \times Y) \arrow[r] & CH_{n-d}(k(X) \times Y) \arrow[r] & 0.
\end{tikzcd}$$

Since the map $CH_d(X \times X) \to CH_0(k(X) \times X)$ is obtained as the direct limit, ranging over the open subsets U of X, of the flat pullback maps $CH_d(X \times X) \to CH_0(U \times X)$, we see that $[\Delta_X] \in CH_d(X \times X)$ is mapped to $[\eta_X] \in CH_0(k(X) \times X)$. Besides, by lemma 3.1, $(\Delta_X, \Gamma)_*\Delta_X = \Gamma \circ \Delta_X = \Gamma$. The lemma then follows by commutativity of the diagram above. □

Theorem 3.6. *Let $M = (X, p)$ and $N = (Y, q, n)$ be two motives over a field k and let $\varphi : N \to M$ be a morphism. Suppose that $(\varphi_{k(X)})_* : CH_0(N_{k(X)}) \to CH_0(M_{k(X)})$ is surjective. Then there exist a morphism $\Gamma_1 : M \to N$, a smooth projective variety Z of dimension* $\dim X - 1$ *over k and a morphism $\Gamma_2 : M \to M$ that factors through the motive $(Z, \Delta_Z, 1)$ such that*

$$p = \varphi \circ \Gamma_1 + \Gamma_2.$$

Proof. Thanks to lemma 3.4 we have the following commutative diagram, whose rows are exact by localisation.

$$\begin{tikzcd}
CH_{d-n}(X \times Y) \arrow[r] \arrow[d, "(\Delta_X{,}\varphi)_*"] & CH_{-n}(k(X) \times Y) \arrow[r] \arrow[d, "(\varphi_{k(X)})_*"] & 0 \\
CH_d(X \times X) \arrow[r] & CH_0(k(X) \times X) \arrow[r] & 0.
\end{tikzcd}$$

Let η_X be the generic point of X and let's view it as a rational point of $k(X) \times X$ over $k(X)$. Then $p \in CH_d(X \times X)$ maps to $(p_{k(X)})_*[\eta_X] \in CH_0(k(X) \times X)$ by lemma 3.5. Because $(\varphi_{k(X)})_* : CH_0(N_{k(X)}) \to CH_0(M_{k(X)})$ is surjective, there exists $y \in CH_{-n}(k(X) \times Y)$ such that $(\varphi_{k(X)})_* y = (p_{k(X)})_*[\eta_X]$. Let α be a lift of y in $CH_{d-n}(X \times Y)$. By commutativity of the diagram, we have that $\Gamma_2 := p - (\Delta_X, \varphi)_*\alpha$ maps to zero in $CH_0(k(X) \times X)$. Therefore, by the localisation exact sequence for Chow groups, Γ_2 is supported on $D \times X$ for some codimension-one closed subscheme D of X, i.e. there is a $\beta \in CH_d(D \times X)$ that maps to Γ_2. Let's write $\iota : D \hookrightarrow X$ for the inclusion map. If $\sigma : Z \to D$ is an alteration of D, then we see that actually there is a $\gamma \in CH_d(Z \times X)$ that maps to Γ_2 under the natural map $CH_d(Z \times X) \to CH_d(X \times X)$. By lemma 3.1, we then have $\Gamma_2 = ((\iota \circ \sigma) \times \mathrm{id}_X)_*\gamma = \Gamma_{\iota\circ\sigma} \circ \gamma$, so that Γ_2 factors through $(Z, \Delta_Z, 1)$. By lemma 3.1 again, we have $(\Delta_X, \varphi)_*\alpha = \varphi \circ \alpha$, so that if we set $\Gamma_1 := q \circ \alpha \circ p$ then we have $p = \varphi \circ \Gamma_1 + \Gamma_2$. $\square$

Proposition 3.7. *Let X be a smooth projective variety of dimension d defined over a subfield of $\mathbf{C}$ and let $k > d$. Assume that $H_k(X) = \widetilde{N}^{\lfloor k/2 \rfloor - 1} H_k(X)$. Here $\widetilde{N}$ denotes the niveau filtration of [13]. In other words assume that*

- *if k is odd, there exist a threefold Y_k and a correspondence $\Gamma_k \in CH_{\frac{k+3}{2}}(Y_k \times X)$ such that $(\Gamma_k)_* : H_3(Y_k) \to H_k(X)$ is surjective, and*
- *if k is even, there exist a surface Z_k and a correspondence $\Gamma_k \in CH_{\frac{k+2}{2}}(Z_k \times X)$ such that $(\Gamma_k)_* : H_2(Z_k) \to H_k(X)$ is surjective.*

Then X satisfies the Lefschetz standard conjecture in degree k. $\square$

Proof. Let $k > d$ be as in the proposition and let r be equal to 2 if k is even and to 3 if k is odd. Let Y be a smooth projective variety of dimension r and let $\Gamma \in CH_{\frac{k+3}{2}}(Y \times X)$ be a correspondence such that $\Gamma_* : H_r(Y) \to H_k(X)$ is surjective. Let L be the map $H_k(X) \to H_{2d-k}(X)$ induced by intersecting $k - d$ times with a hyperplane section of X. The hard Lefschetz theorem says that L is an isomorphism. We have to prove that its inverse is induced by an algebraic cycle. For this purpose, it is actually enough to construct an algebraic cycle $\alpha \in CH_{d+k}(X \times X)$ that induces a morphism $\alpha_* : H_{2d-k}(X) \to H_k(X)$ which is injective. Indeed, in that case, $\alpha_* \circ L : H_k(X) \to H_k(X)$ is an automorphism for dimension reasons. By the theorem of Cayley-Hamilton, its inverse is given by $P(\alpha_* \circ L)$ for some polynomial P. Hence, the inverse to $\alpha_* \circ L$ is induced by a correspondence $\beta \in CH_d(X \times X)$. It is then clear that $\beta \circ \alpha$ induces the inverse of $L : H_k(X) \to H_{2d-k}(X)$.

Let $\iota : H_Y \to Y$ be a smooth hyperplane section and write L_Y for the correspondence $\Gamma_\iota \circ {}^t\Gamma_\iota \in CH_{r-1}(Y \times Y)$. Consider the Lefschetz decomposition $H_r(Y) = H_r(Y)_{prim} \oplus (L_Y)_* H_{r+2}(Y)$. This decomposition is orthogonal for the cup-product on $H_r(Y)$ and if p_1 denotes the orthogonal projection on $(L_Y)_* H_{r+2}(Y)$, then the Hodge index formula says that the Hodge structure $H_r(Y)$ endowed with the bilinear form $\langle -, (id - 2p_1)(-) \rangle$ is polarized. Because the Lefschetz standard conjecture holds in degrees ≤ 1, there exists a correspondence $A \in CH_{r+2}(Y \times Y)$ whose action on $H_{r-2}(Y)$ is the inverse to the Lefschetz isomorphism $L_Y^2 : H_{r+2}(Y) \to H_{r-2}(Y)$. Because $H_r(Y)_{prim}$ is the kernel of the action of L_Y on $H_r(Y)$, it follows that the correspondence $B := L_Y \circ A \circ L_Y$ acts on $H_r(Y)$ as p_1 does. Consider then the correspondence $s := \Delta_Y - 2B \in CH_r(Y \times Y)$. The dual map to $\Gamma_* : H_r(Y) \to H_k(X)$ is injective. This yields that the correspondence $\Gamma \circ s \circ {}^t\Gamma$ induces an injective map $H_{2d-k}(X) \to H_k(X)$ and we are done. $\square$

Proof of theorem 1. By theorem 3.6, we get that

$$\Delta_X = \Gamma \circ \Gamma_1 + \Gamma_2 \in CH_d(X \times X),$$

for some correspondence $\Gamma_1 \in CH_d(X \times Y)$ and some correspondence $\Gamma_2 \in CH_d(X \times X)$ that factors as $\Gamma_2 = \alpha \circ \beta$ for some smooth projective variety Z and for some $\beta \in CH^d(X \times Z)$ and some $\alpha \in CH_d(Z \times X)$. By looking at the action of Δ_X on $H^k(X)$, we see that

$$H^k(X) = \Gamma_1^* H^k(Y) + \beta^* H^{k-2}(Z).$$

This settles theorem 1 thanks to proposition 3.7. □

4 On the motive of fourfolds with a nef tangent bundle

In this section we prove the first two points of theorem 2, i.e. we prove theorem 2 when $\dim X = 4$. Precisely we prove the following (the case $\dim X = 3$ is postponed to the next section).

Theorem 4.1. *Let X be a smooth projective fourfold over a field $k \subseteq \mathbf{C}$. Assume that there exist a smooth projective variety Y which satisfies Grothendieck's Lefschetz standard conjecture and which is finite-dimensional in the sense of Kimura, as well as a correspondence $\Gamma \in CH_{\dim Y}(Y \times X)$ such that the induced map $(\Gamma_{k(X)})_* : CH_0(Y_{k(X)}) \to CH_0(X_{k(X)})$ is surjective. Then X has a Chow-Künneth decomposition which satisfies the motivic Lefschetz conjecture and Murre's conjecture (B). If moreover $\dim Y \leq 3$, then X satisfies Murre's conjecture (D).*

Theorem 4.1 is divided into propositions 4.11, 4.12, 4.15 and 4.19.

Let's denote by $\mathcal{M}$ the category of Chow motives with rational coefficients. This is a rigid $\otimes$-category which is pseudo-abelian. A full subcategory of $\mathcal{M}$ is said to be rigid if it is stable by tensor product and dual, it is said to be thick if it is stable by direct sum and direct summand. We then define the thick and rigid full subcategory $\mathcal{M}_{FD}$ of $\mathcal{M}$ whose objects consist of motives which are finite-dimensional in the sense of Kimura [9]. It contains the motives of curves.

Let's then denote by $\overline{\mathcal{M}}$ (resp. $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{FD}$) the reduction modulo numerical equivalence of $\mathcal{M}$ (resp. $\mathcal{M}_{FD}$). Jannsen [7] proved that the category $\overline{\mathcal{M}}$ of motives for numerical equivalence is abelian semi-simple.

Lemma 4.2. *Let M be an object in $\mathcal{M}_{FD}$. Then the map $\mathrm{End}_{\mathcal{M}}(M) \to \mathrm{End}_{\overline{\mathcal{M}}}(\overline{M})$ has nilpotent kernel.*

Proof. This is due to Shun-Ichi Kimura [9, Prop. 7.5]. □

Here is an important consequence of lemma 4.2.

Lemma 4.3. *The functor $\mathcal{M}_{FD} \to \overline{\mathcal{M}}_{FD}$ is conservative, i.e. if M and N are objects in $\mathcal{M}_{FD}$ and if $f \in \mathrm{Hom}(M, N)$ is such that $\overline{f} : \overline{M} \to \overline{N}$ is an isomorphism then f is an isomorphism.* □

The following proposition is well-known.

Proposition 4.4. *Let* $M = (X, p, n)$ *be an object in* $\mathcal{M}_{FD}$*. If* X *satisfies Grothendieck's Lefschetz standard conjecture, then* X *has a Chow-Künneth decomposition.*

Proof. The motive $M(-n)$ is isomorphic to a direct summand of $\mathfrak{h}(X) := (X, \Delta_X)$. By [1, 5.4.2.1], X has a Künneth decomposition. Since the Künneth projectors are central, it follows that $\overline{M}(-n)$ has a Künneth decomposition and hence so does $\overline{M}$. By [8, Lemma 5.4], lemma 4.2 implies that this Künneth decomposition of $\overline{M}$ lifts to a Chow-Künneth decomposition of M. $\square$

In the case of effective motives, we have the following refinement.

Proposition 4.5. *Let* X *be a variety that satisfies the Lefschetz standard conjecture and let* $p \in CH_{\dim X}(X \times X)$ *be an idempotent. Assume that* $M = (X, p)$ *is isomorphic to an object in* $\mathcal{M}_{FD}$*. Then every Chow-Künneth decomposition* $M = \bigoplus_{0 \leq i \leq 2 \dim X} M_i$ *satisfies the following property: There exist smooth projective varieties* Y_i *of dimension* $\leq i$ *such that* M_i *is isomorphic to a direct summand of* $\mathfrak{h}(Y_i) := (Y_i, \Delta_{Y_i})$*.*

Proof. Since any direct summand of a finite-dimensional motive is finite-dimensional, the motive M_i is isomorphic to an object in $\mathcal{M}_{FD}$. Let's write $M_i = (X, p_i)$. Let Y_i be a smooth linear section of X of dimension $\min(i, d)$. Because X satisfies the Lefschetz standard conjecture, by [1, 5.2.5.1], we have that the morphism $\overline{\mathfrak{h}}(Y_i) \to \overline{M}_i$ is surjective. By semisimplicity it has a retraction, and by finite-dimensionality of M_i we see thanks to lemmas 4.2 and 4.3 that M_i is isomorphic to a direct summand of $\mathfrak{h}(Y_i)$. $\square$

If X is a variety as in theorem 2, by semisimplicity let's consider the largest submotive of $\overline{\mathfrak{h}}(X)$ that belongs to $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{FD}$ and let's denote it by $\overline{M}$. In other words, we have

$$\overline{M} = \sum \mathrm{Im}\,(\overline{P} \to \overline{\mathfrak{h}}(X)),$$

where the sum runs through all objects $\overline{P}$ in $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{FD}$ and all morphisms $\overline{P} \to \overline{\mathfrak{h}}(X)$ in $\mathrm{Hom}_{\overline{\mathcal{M}}}(\overline{P}, \overline{\mathfrak{h}}(X))$. By finite-dimensionality the direct summand $\overline{M}$ of $\overline{\mathfrak{h}}(X)$ lifts to rational equivalence to a direct summand M of $\mathfrak{h}(X)$. Let's then write

$$(\star) \qquad\qquad \mathfrak{h}(X) = M \oplus N.$$

The motive M is unique up to (non-unique) isomorphism thanks to lemma 4.3. By construction of M, the motive N satisfies the property that any morphism $P \to N$ for P finite-dimensional is numerically trivial. It also satisfies the property that any morphism $N \to P$ for P finite-dimensional is numerically trivial. Indeed, if not, then the image of $\overline{N} \to \overline{P}$ is non-trivial and by finite-dimensionality of P it lifts to a non-trivial motive in $\mathcal{M}_{FD}$ which is isomorphic to a direct summand of N. By conservativity (lemma 4.3) this gives a non-trivial direct summand of $\overline{N}$ that lies in $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{FD}$. This is not possible by construction of N. It follows by looking at the dual decomposition

$$(\star^\vee) \qquad \mathfrak{h}(X) = \mathfrak{h}(X)^\vee(4) = M^\vee(4) \oplus N^\vee(4)$$

that N is isomorphic to $N^\vee(4)$ modulo numerical equivalence and that M is isomorphic to $M^\vee(4)$ modulo numerical equivalence. By lemma 4.3 (or by unicity of M up to isomorphism, as discussed above), we get that M is isomorphic to $M^\vee(4)$. Deciding if N in the decomposition ($\star$) is unique up to isomorphism doesn't seem easy, see remark 4.17 below.

Lemma 4.6. *Let $N = (X, p)$ be a Chow motive in $\mathcal{M}$. Assume that there is an object P in $\mathcal{M}_{FD}$ and a morphism $\gamma \in \mathrm{Hom}(P, N)$ such that γ is numerically trivial and $(\gamma_{k(X)})_* : CH_0(P_{k(X)}) \to CH_0(N_{k(X)})$ is surjective. Then $CH_0(N_K) = 0$ for all field extensions K/k.*

Proof. By theorem 3.6 we get the existence of $\Gamma_1 \in \mathrm{Hom}(N, P)$ and of $\Gamma_2 \in \mathrm{End}(\mathfrak{h}(X))$ which factors through $(Z, \Delta_Z, 1)$ for some variety Z such that $p = \gamma \circ \Gamma_1 + \Gamma_2$. The arguments below work equally well after base change to K and without loss of generality we therefore assume $K = k$. The action of Γ_2 on $CH_0(X)$ factors through $CH_0(Z, \Delta_Z, 1) = CH_{-1}(Z) = 0$, so that Γ_2 acts trivially on $CH_0(X)$. Therefore $p_*x = (\gamma \circ \Gamma_1)_*x$ for all $x \in CH_0(X)$. Since p is an idempotent we also get $p_*x = (\gamma \circ \Gamma_1)_*^{\circ n}x$ for all positive integers n and all $x \in CH_0(X)$. By assumption γ is numerically trivial. Hence $\Gamma_1 \circ \gamma \in \mathrm{End}(P)$ is numerically trivial. Now P belongs to $\mathcal{M}_{FD}$ and lemma 4.2 yields that $\Gamma_1 \circ \gamma$ is nilpotent. We have thus proved that $p_*x = 0$ for all $x \in CH_0(X)$, i.e. that $CH_0(N) = 0$. ☐

Proposition 4.7. *Let N be as in ($\star$). Then $CH_0(N_K) = 0$ for all field extensions K/k.*

Proof. Let's check that the assumptions of lemma 4.6 are fulfilled by N. By construction, $\overline{N}$ has no direct summand isomorphic to an object in $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{FD}$. By the assumptions of theorem 2, the correspondence $\Gamma \in \mathrm{Hom}(\mathfrak{h}(Y), \mathfrak{h}(X))$ induces a surjection $CH_0(Y_{k(X)}) \to CH_0(X_{k(X)})$ and it follows that the induced map $CH_0(Y_{k(X)}) \to CH_0(N_{k(X)})$ is also surjective. ☐

Proposition 4.8. *There exists a smooth projective variety Z of dimension 3 and an idempotent $q \in CH_3(Z \times Z)$ such that $N \simeq (Z, q, 1)$.*

Proof. By proposition 4.7 we have $CH_0(N_{k(X)}) = 0$. The statement thus follows immediately from theorem 3.6. ☐

In the next two propositions we write $N' := (Z, q)$.

Proposition 4.9. *$H_0(N') = 0$ and $H_1(N') = 0$. Similarly $H_0(Z, {}^tq) = 0$ and $H_1(Z, {}^tq) = 0$.*

Proof. In [12], we constructed mutually orthogonal idempotents q_0 and q_1 that commute with q with the following properties:

- $H_0(Z,q) = H_*(Z,q_0)$ and $H_1(Z,q) = H_*(Z,q_1)$,
- (Z,q_0) is isomorphic to $\mathbb{1}^n$ where $n = \dim H_0(Z,q)$ and (Z,q_1) is isomorphic to the $\mathfrak{h}_1$ of an abelian variety.

Hence if $H_0(N') \neq 0$ or $H_1(N') \neq 0$, then N' has a non-trivial direct factor that belongs to $\mathcal{M}_{FD}$. This is a contradiction. Likewise the motive $(Z, {}^tq) = (N')^\vee(3)$ cannot be such that $H_0(Z, {}^tq) \neq 0$ or $H_1(Z, {}^tq) \neq 0$. □

Proposition 4.10. *$H_*(N') = H_2(N')$, i.e. N' is pure of weight 2.*

Proof. By proposition 4.9 we already know that $H_0(N') = 0$ and $H_1(N') = 0$. From the discussion following the decomposition $(\star^\vee)$, we have that $\overline{N}'(1)$ is isomorphic to $(\overline{N}')^\vee(3)$ and hence that $(Z,q,0)$ is isomorphic to $(Z,{}^tq,-1)$ modulo numerical equivalence. These two motives are isomorphic to direct summands of $\mathfrak{h}(X)(-1)$. Because X satisfies the Lefschetz standard conjecture, X also satisfies the Künneth standard conjecture [1, 5.4.2.1]. Jannsen's [7, Corollary 1] implies that $(Z,q,0)$ is isomorphic to $(Z,{}^tq,-1)$ modulo homological equivalence. Thus $H_i(Z,q) \simeq H_{i+2}(Z,{}^tq)$. By Poincaré duality the $\mathbf{Q}$-vector spaces $H_5(Z,{}^tq)$ and $H_1(Z,q)$ have same dimension. The $\mathbf{Q}$-vector spaces $H_6(Z,{}^tq)$ and $H_0(Z,q)$ have same dimension, too. By proposition 4.9 again, we get $H_3(N') = 0$ and $H_4(N') = 0$. That $H_i(N') = 0$ for $i > 4$ is straightforward in view of the isomorphism $H_i(Z,q) \simeq H_{i+2}(Z,{}^tq)$ and of the fact that $\dim Z \leq 3$. □

Proposition 4.11. *X satisfies Murre's conjecture (A). More precisely, X has a Chow-Künneth decomposition $\{\pi_i : 0 \leq i \leq 8\}$ with the following property: if $i \leq 4$, then (X,π_i) is isomorphic to a direct summand of $\mathfrak{h}(Y_i)$ for some variety Y_i of dimension i.*

Proof. We have the decomposition $(\star)$ $\mathfrak{h}(X) = M \oplus N$, where M finite-dimensional in the sense of Kimura and N is pure of weight 4 by proposition 4.10. By theorem 1, X satisfies the Lefschetz standard conjecture. By proposition 4.5, M has a Chow-Künneth decomposition $\{\pi_0,\pi_1,\pi_2,\pi_3,\pi_4^0,\pi_5,\pi_6,\pi_7,\pi_8\}$ with (X,π_i) being isomorphic to a direct summand of $\mathfrak{h}(Y_i)$ for some variety Y_i of dimension $\min(i,d)$. Let's then write $N = (X,\pi_4^1)$ and let's define $\pi_4 := \pi_4^0 + \pi_4^1$. It follows that $\{\pi_i : 0 \leq i \leq 8\}$ is a Chow-Künneth decomposition for X with the stated property. □

From now on, X comes with the Chow-Künneth decomposition constructed above and all the statements below are for X endowed with this Chow-Künneth decomposition.

Proposition 4.12. *X satisfies the motivic Lefschetz conjecture.*

Proof. By theorem 1 we know that X satisfies the Lefschetz standard conjecture, so that the morphism $(X,\pi_{8-i}) \to (X,\pi_i,4-i)$ induced by intersecting $4-i$ times with a hyperplane section is an isomorphism modulo numerical equivalence, see [1, 5.2.5.1]. The motives (X, π_{8-i}) and $(X, \pi_i, 4-i)$ are Kimura finite-dimensional for all $i < 4$. By proposition 4.3, the morphisms $(X, \pi_{8-i}) \to (X, \pi_i, 4-i)$ are then isomorphisms for all $i < 4$. $\square$

Lemma 4.13. *Let $N = (Y, q)$ be a motive and let $r \in CH_{\dim Y}(Y \times Y)$ be an idempotent such that (Y, r) is finite-dimensional in the sense of Kimura. Assume that for an integer i we have $CH_i(Y) = CH_i(Y, r)$. If either $q \circ r$ or $r \circ q$ is numerically trivial, then $CH_i(N) = 0$.*

Proof. It follows immediately that $r \circ q \circ r \in \mathrm{End}(Y, r)$ is numerically trivial. By lemma 4.2, $r \circ q \circ r$ is nilpotent. By assumption r acts as the identity on $CH_i(Y)$, therefore $(r \circ q \circ r)^{\circ N}$ acts the same way as $q^{\circ N}$ on $CH_i(Y)$ for all integers $N \geq 0$. Because q is an idempotent we see, after taking N large enough, that q acts trivially on $CH_i(Y)$, i.e. that $CH_i(N) = 0$. $\square$

Lemma 4.14. *Let (Y, q) be a motive. If $H^2(Y, q) = H^1(Y, q) = 0$, then $CH^1(Y, q) = 0$.*

Proof. Let π^2_{alg} be an idempotent in $CH_{\dim Y}(Y \times Y)$ such that (Y, π^2_{alg}) is isomorphic to $\mathbb{1}(\dim Y - 1)^{\oplus \rho(Y)}$. Here $\rho(Y)$ is the rank of the Néron-Severi group of Y. Let $\pi^1 \in CH_{\dim Y}(Y \times Y)$ be Murre's Picard projector [10]. It is such that $(Y, \pi^1) \simeq \mathfrak{h}^1(\mathrm{Pic}^0_Y)$, $CH^*(Y, \pi^1) = CH^1(Y)_{\mathrm{num}}$ and $H^*(Y, \pi^1) = H^1(Y)$. It is easy to check that $\pi^2_{alg} \circ \pi^1 = 0$, so that if we replace π^2_{alg} with $(1 - \frac{1}{2}\pi^1) \circ \pi^2_{alg}$ and π^1 with $\pi^1 \circ (1 - \frac{1}{2}\pi^2_{alg})$, we get orthogonal idempotents having the same properties as the ones listed above.

Let's then define $r := \pi^2_{alg} + \pi^1$. Then (Y, r) is finite-dimensional and $CH^1(Y, r) = CH^1(Y)$. Also by assumption, we have that $q \circ r$ is homologically trivial and hence numerically trivial. We can therefore conclude by lemma 4.13. $\square$

Proposition 4.15. *X satisfies Murre's conjecture (B).*

Proof. By propositions 4.11 and 4.12, we know that, for $i \leq 4$, there exist varieties Y_i of dimension i such that (X, π_i) is isomorphic to a direct summand of $\mathfrak{h}(Y_i)$ for $i \leq 4$ and such that (X, π_i) is isomorphic to a direct summand of $\mathfrak{h}(Y_{8-i})(i-4)$ for $i > 4$. The result then follows immediately from lemma 4.14. $\square$

Lemma 4.16. *If $\dim Y \leq 3$, then $CH_0(X_{k(X)}, {}^t\pi^0_4) = 0$.*

Proof. The variety Y is Kimura finite-dimensional and satisfies the Lefschetz standard conjecture. Therefore, by [13, Prop. 4.6 & Th. 4.8] which is stated below as theorem 5.4, Y has a Chow-Künneth decomposition $\{\pi^Y_i, 0 \leq i \leq 6\}$ that satisfies Murre's conjecture (B). In particular, $CH_0(Y_{k(X)}) = \bigoplus_{i \leq 3} CH_0(Y_{k(X)}, (\pi^Y_i)_{k(X)})$. We know from the assumptions on X that there is a correspondence $\Gamma \in CH_3(Y \times X)$ such that $(\Gamma_{k(X)})_* : CH_0(Y_{k(X)}) \to CH_0(X_{k(X)})$ is surjective. By finite-dimensionality of Y, the image of the morphism $\overline{\Gamma} : \bigoplus_{i \leq 3}(Y, \overline{\pi}^Y_i) \to \overline{\mathfrak{h}}(X)$ lifts to a direct summand of $\mathfrak{h}(X)$ that we write (X, r). We now claim that $CH_0(X_{k(X)}) = CH_0(X_{k(X)}, r_{k(X)})$. For this purpose we have to show that

$CH_0(X_{k(X)}, \Delta_{X_{k(X)}} - r_{k(X)}) = 0$. This follows from lemma 4.6 with $\gamma = (\Delta_X - r) \circ \Gamma$. The motive (X, r) is Kimura finite-dimensional and has homology only in degrees ≤ 3. The motive (X, π_4^0) is pure of degree 4 and so is the motive $(X, {}^t\pi_4^0)$ by Poincaré duality. Thus both $\pi_4^0 \circ r$ and ${}^t\pi_4^0 \circ r$ are homologically trivial and hence numerically trivial. Lemma 4.13 then implies that $CH_0(X_{k(X)}, \pi_4^0) = 0$ and $CH_0(X_{k(X)}, {}^t\pi_4^0) = 0$. $\square$

Remark 4.17. The reason for focusing on $CH_0(X_{k(X)}, {}^t\pi_4^0)$ rather than on $CH_0(X_{k(X)}, \pi_4^0)$ will become apparent in the proof of proposition 4.19. What we want to prove is that π_4^0 and π_4^1 have representatives supported on $X \times D$ for some divisor D inside X. Knowing $CH_0(X_{k(X)}, \pi_4) = 0$ only gives that $\pi_4 = \pi_4^0 + \pi_4^1$ has a representative supported on $D \times X$. It would then be possible to conclude that $\pi_4 = \pi_4^0 + \pi_4^1$ has a representative supported on $X \times D$ if we could show that (X, π_4) is isomorphic to $(X, {}^t\pi_4)$. This I cannot show. (Even though it is possible to show that $(X, \Delta_X - \pi_4)$ is isomorphic to $(X, \Delta_X - {}^t\pi_4)$ by finite-dimensionality.)

Lemma 4.18. *Let (X, π_{2n}) be a motive over a field $k \subset \mathbf{C}$ of pure weight $2n$. Assume that (X, π_{2n}) is isomorphic to a motive (Y, q, m) for some variety Y of dimension $\leq n + 1 - m$. Then,*

$$\mathrm{Ker}\,\big((\pi_{2n})_* : CH_n(X) \to CH_n(X)\big) = \mathrm{Ker}\,\big(CH_n(X) \to H_{2n}(X)\big).$$

In other words, the n-cycles on X satisfy Murre's conjecture (D).

Proof. This is proved in [13, Lemma 4.16]. $\square$

Proposition 4.19. *The i-cycles on X satisfy Murre's conjecture (D) for $i \neq 2$. Moreover, if $\dim Y \leq 3$, then the 2-cycles on X also satisfy Murre's conjecture (D).*

Proof. By propositions 4.11 and 4.12, π_0, π_2, π_6 and π_8 satisfy the assumptions of lemma 4.18. Therefore the i-cycles on X satisfy Murre's conjecture (D) for $i \neq 2$.

Let's now assume that $\dim Y \leq 3$. By lemma 4.16 and theorem 3.6, it follows that $(X, {}^t\pi_4^0, -1)$ is isomorphic to a direct summand of the motive of a threefold. Now propositions 4.7 applied to the decomposition $(\star^\vee)$ instead of the decomposition $(\star)$ gives $CH_0(N^\vee_{k(X)}(4)) = 0$. It follows from proposition 4.8 applied to $N^\vee(4)$ that $N^\vee(3) = (X, {}^t\pi_4^1, -1)$ is isomorphic to a direct summand of the motive of a threefold. Recall that we have the orthogonal sum $\pi_4 = \pi_4^0 + \pi_4^1$. The motive (X, π_4) is then isomorphic to a direct summand of the motive of a threefold. Lemma 4.18 makes it possible to conclude. $\square$

5 On the motive of threefolds with a nef tangent bundle

In this section we wish to prove theorem 2 for threefolds. In particular, in view of corollary 2.4, we prove that threefolds with a nef tangent bundle are finite-dimensional in the sense of Kimura and satisfy Murre's conjectures (A), (B) and (D). This was already proved by Iyer [6]:

Theorem 5.1 (Iyer [6]). *Let X be a complex threefold with a nef tangent bundle. Then X is finite-dimensional in the sense of Kimura and satisfies Murre's conjectures (A), (B) and (D).*

Iyer's proof is different from the one exposed below; it uses a classification result of Campana-Peternell [3, Th. 10.1] which states that threefolds with a nef tangent bundle and with maximum irregularity among all of their étale covers are relative cellular varieties over an abelian variety. However, it seems that the argument of Iyer [6, p. 1676] is incomplete since the irregularity may increase after some finite étale cover of X. Thus it seems that Iyer only shows Murre's conjectures for threefolds which have a nef tangent bundle and which have maximum irregularity among all of their finite étale covers.

Here we prove a more general statement.

Theorem 5.2. *Let X be a smooth projective threefold over a field $k \subseteq \mathbf{C}$. Assume that there exist a smooth projective variety Y which satisfies Grothendieck's Lefschetz standard conjecture and which is finite-dimensional in the sense of Kimura, as well as a correspondence $\Gamma \in CH_{\dim Y}(Y \times X)$ such that the induced map $(\Gamma_{k(X)})_* : CH_0(Y_{k(X)}) \to CH_0(X_{k(X)})$ is surjective. Then X is finite-dimensional in the sense of Kimura and satisfies Murre's conjectures (A), (B) and (D). If moreover* $\dim Y \leq 2$, *X satisfies Murre's conjecture (C).*

Let X be as in the theorem. We could prove Murre's conjectures (A), (B) and (D) the same way we did for fourfolds, or we could apply theorem 4.1 to $X \times \mathbf{P}^1$. However, we follow another path and prove finite-dimensionality first and deduce Murre's conjectures for X by using the results of [13, §4.2]. Our theorem 5.2 complements Iyer's theorem by showing Murre's conjecture (C) for threefolds with a nef tangent bundle which are not the finite quotients of an abelian threefold.

Let's now move on to proving theorem 5.2.

Lemma 5.3. *Let $N = (Y, q, n)$ be a motive. Assume that Y satisfies the Lefschetz standard conjecture and that all morphisms $P \to N$ for P in $\mathcal{M}_{FD}$ are numerically trivial. Then $CH^1(Y_K, q_K) = 0$ for all field extensions K/k.*

Proof. If P is Kimura finite-dimensional, then P_K is too. If $P \to N$ is numerically trivial for all P in $\mathcal{M}_{FD}$, then in particular for all curves C and all integers l every morphism $\mathfrak{h}(C)(l) \to N$ is numerically trivial. By assumption Y satisfies the Lefschetz standard conjecture so that $C \times Y$ does too for all curves C. Therefore, by [1, 5.4.2.1], homological and numerical equivalence agree on $C \times Y$. Thus, every morphism $\mathfrak{h}(C)(l) \to N$ is homologically trivial. It follows that every morphism $\mathfrak{h}(C_K)(l) \to N_K$ is homologically trivial and hence numerically trivial. Let $r := \pi^2_{alg} + \pi^1 \in CH_{\dim Y}(Y \times Y)$ be a correspondence as in the proof of lemma 4.14. Then, because r factors through a curve, r_K is numerically trivial by the above discussion. The lemma then follows from lemma 4.13. $\square$

Proof of finite-dimensionality in theorem 5.2. Consider the decomposition $(\star)$ $\mathfrak{h}(X) = M \oplus N$ of section 4, i.e. M is finite-dimensional and any morphism $P \to N$ is numerically trivial for P a finite-dimensional motive. By proposition 4.7, we have $CH_0(N_{k(X)}) = 0$. Therefore, by theorem 3.6, there exist a variety S of dimension ≤ 2 and an idempotent $q \in CH_{\dim S}(S \times S)$ such that $N \simeq (S, q, 1)$. If $\dim S = 1$, then N is finite-dimensional so that $N = 0$. Let's thus assume that $\dim S = 2$. As argued in the proof of proposition 4.10 we have an isomorphism $(S, q, 0) \simeq (S, {}^tq, -1)$. Therefore, $CH_0(S_{k(S)}, q_{k(S)}) = CH_1(S_{k(S)}, {}^tq_{k(S)})$. But $CH_1(S_{k(S)}, {}^tq_{k(S)}) = CH^1(S_{k(S)}, {}^tq_{k(S)})$ must vanish by lemma 5.3. Hence, by theorem 3.6 again, $N(-1) \simeq (S, q)$ is isomorphic to a direct summand of the motive of a curve. It follows that $N(-1)$ is finite-dimensional and hence that $N = 0$.

We have thus proved that $\mathfrak{h}(X) = M$, i.e. that X is Kimura finite-dimensional. $\square$

Proof of Murre's conjectures (A), (B) and (D) in theorem 5.2. Thanks to theorem 1 we know that a variety X as in theorem 5.2 satisfies the Lefschetz standard conjecture. We can now invoke:

Theorem 5.4 (Proposition 4.6 & Theorem 4.8 in [13])**.** *Let X be a variety of dimension ≤ 3 which satisfies the Lefschetz standard conjecture and which is finite-dimensional in the sense of Kimura. Then X satisfies Murre's conjectures (A), (B) and (D).*

which concludes the proof. $\square$

Finally, let's finish off the proof of theorem 5.2.

Proposition 5.5. *Let X and Y be as in theorem 5.2 and assume that* $\dim Y \leq 2$*. Then X has a Chow-Künneth decomposition and X satisfies Murre's conjecture (C).*

Proof. We now know that X is Kimura finite-dimensional and that it satisfies the Lefschetz standard conjecture. Thus, according to [13, Theorem 4.8], we only need to prove that $H_3(X)$ is supported on a divisor. By theorem 3.6, $\Delta_X = \varphi \circ \Gamma_1 + \Gamma_2$ for some correspondences $\Gamma_1 \in CH_2(Y \times X)$ and some correspondence $\Gamma_2 \in CH_3(X \times X)$ supported on $D \times X$ for some divisor D in X. This immediately implies that $H_3(X)$ is supported on a divisor. $\square$

We thus obtain, in view of proposition 2.3, the following.

Theorem 5.6. *Let $f : X' \dashrightarrow Y$ be a dominant rational map to a variety Y which satisfies the Lefschetz standard conjecture and which is finite-dimensional in the sense of Kimura. Assume that a general fibre F of a resolution of f satisfies $CH_0(F) = \mathbf{Q}$. Let $X' \dashrightarrow X$ be a dominant rational map to a variety X of dimension ≤ 3. Then X is Kimura finite-dimensional and satisfies Murre's conjectures (A), (B) and (D). If moreover* $\dim Y \leq 2$ *then X satisfies Murre's conjecture (C).* $\square$

By the theorem of Demailly-Peternell-Schneider theorem 5.1 immediately follows. Thus theorem 5.2 is indeed a refinement of Iyer's theorem 5.1.

References

[1] Yves André. *Une introduction aux motifs (motifs purs, motifs mixtes, périodes)*, volume 17 of *Panoramas et Synthèses [Panoramas and Syntheses]*. Société Mathématique de France, Paris, 2004.

[2] S. Bloch and V. Srinivas. Remarks on correspondences and algebraic cycles. *Amer. J. Math.*, 105(5):1235–1253, 1983.

[3] Frédéric Campana and Thomas Peternell. Projective manifolds whose tangent bundles are numerically effective. *Math. Ann.*, 289(1):169–187, 1991.

[4] Jean-Pierre Demailly, Thomas Peternell, and Michael Schneider. Compact complex manifolds with numerically effective tangent bundles. *J. Algebraic Geom.*, 3(2):295–345, 1994.

[5] William Fulton. *Intersection theory*, volume 2 of *Ergebnisse der Mathematik und ihrer Grenzgebiete. 3. Folge. A Series of Modern Surveys in Mathematics [Results in Mathematics and Related Areas. 3rd Series. A Series of Modern Surveys in Mathematics]*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, second edition, 1998.

[6] Jaya N. N. Iyer. Murre's conjectures and explicit Chow-Künneth projections for varieties with a NEF tangent bundle. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 361(3):1667–1681, 2009.

[7] Uwe Jannsen. Motives, numerical equivalence, and semi-simplicity. *Invent. Math.*, 107(3):447–452, 1992.

[8] Uwe Jannsen. Motivic sheaves and filtrations on Chow groups. In *Motives (Seattle, WA, 1991)*, volume 55 of *Proc. Sympos. Pure Math.*, pages 245–302. Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 1994.

[9] Shun-Ichi Kimura. Chow groups are finite dimensional, in some sense. *Math. Ann.*, 331(1):173–201, 2005.

[10] J. P. Murre. On the motive of an algebraic surface. *J. Reine Angew. Math.*, 409:190–204, 1990.

[11] J. P. Murre. On a conjectural filtration on the Chow groups of an algebraic variety. I. The general conjectures and some examples. *Indag. Math. (N.S.)*, 4(2):177–188, 1993.

[12] Charles Vial. Chow-Künneth decomposition for 3- and 4-folds fibred by varieties with small Chow group of zero-cycles. Preprint.

[13] Charles Vial. Niveau and coniveau filtrations on cohomology groups and Chow groups. Preprint.

DPMMS, University of Cambridge, Wilberforce Road, Cambridge, CB3 0WB, UK
e-mail : `C.Vial@dpmms.cam.ac.uk`